

NOTICE: THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.
See Ariz. R. Supreme Court 111(c); ARCAP 28(c); Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.24

FILED BY CLERK

MAY 23 2012

COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
STATE OF ARIZONA
DIVISION TWO

THE STATE OF ARIZONA,)	2 CA-CR 2011-0349
)	DEPARTMENT B
Appellee,)	
)	<u>MEMORANDUM DECISION</u>
v.)	Not for Publication
)	Rule 111, Rules of
LOUIS JOHN FELIX,)	the Supreme Court
)	
Appellant.)	
_____)	

APPEAL FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF PIMA COUNTY

Cause No. CR20103236001

Honorable Richard S. Fields, Judge

AFFIRMED

Isabel G. Garcia, Pima County Legal Defender
By Alex D. Heveri

Tucson
Attorneys for Appellant

K E L L Y, Judge.

¶1 Appellant Louis Felix was charged by indictment with burglary of a non-residential structure, burglary of a residential structure, possession of burglary tools, attempted theft of a means of transportation, and theft of a means of transportation. The state alleged he had two historical prior felony convictions and had been on community supervision at the time he committed the offenses. A jury found him guilty of burglary of a residential structure, possession of burglary tools, and theft of a means of transportation

and the trial court found the state had proved its enhancement allegations after Felix admitted them. The court sentenced Felix to concurrent prison terms consisting of partially aggravated, fourteen-year terms for the burglary and theft convictions, and the presumptive, 3.75-year term for possession of burglary tools. Counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, 2 P.3d 89 (App. 1999). Felix has not filed a supplemental brief.

¶2 Although counsel avows she has found no “meritorious issue to raise on appeal,” she asks this court “to search the record in this case for error.” She asserts our review is not limited to one for fundamental error, arguing that “*Anders* requires the appellate court to review for any error that might warrant relief—fundamental or not.” Even if we were to agree with counsel, it would not change the outcome here. In reviewing the record before us, we have found no error warranting reversal of the convictions, resentencing, or any other form of appellate relief. The convictions are amply supported by the evidence presented at trial and the sentences are both lawful and appear to have been imposed in a lawful manner. Consequently, we affirm the convictions and the sentences.

/s/ Virginia C. Kelly

VIRGINIA C. KELLY, Judge

CONCURRING:

/s/ Garye L. Vásquez

GARYE L. VÁSQUEZ, Presiding Judge

/s/ Philip G. Espinosa

PHILIP G. ESPINOSA, Judge